

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IV, NO. 4

JANUARY 30, 1956



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

No Time for Bipartisanship in Foreign Policy

Tremendous pressure is being exerted here on the Democrats not to make foreign policy an issue in the campaign. The George visit to the White House and the Dulles appeal for a moratorium on partisan debate of "one or two" foreign policy questions are only the two visible peaks of a massive movement to restore bipartisanship. But the Democrats cannot move back toward bipartisanship and forego debate on "one or two" questions of foreign policy without beginning to pull their punches on Dulles. And the most urgent, the main and central issue of American foreign policy today is Dulles himself. He has made himself the issue by boasting that he has on three occasions (in Adlai Stevenson's vivid phrase) played Russian roulette with the peace of the world. Whether he was telling the truth is secondary to the revelation of what really goes on in his mind—how lightly he takes his constitutional obligations and how light-headedly he prances on the edge of the abyss. A man who thinks it proper to behave so secretly and so recklessly cannot be trusted on any foreign policy matter, much less the "one or two" which are most immediately important. To sink back into bipartisanship after his self-revelations in *Life* is not merely to forego partisan advantage after an extraordinary blunder but to abdicate the duties of responsible opposition.

Putting The Democrats on The Defensive

George's silence on emerging from the White House was eloquent; he seemed in no mood to immunize Dulles from criticism. But a campaign cannot be won by pantomime, and unless the Democrats take the offensive in a big way they will have lost their opportunity. From the standpoint of public relations, the Administration has already succeeded in changing the subject. A volatile press and the national mind have been distracted in a way that somehow puts the Democrats on the defensive. The White House and the State Department have executed a clever maneuver. The question now, as they twist it, is not whether Dulles shall be allowed to go on endangering the peace of the world but whether the Democrats will be patriotic enough to give up partisanship on foreign policy!

This is Madison Avenue black magic. The Democrats can only neutralize it if leaders like George and Stevenson begin to say plainly, concretely and publicly what they have been saying obscurely or privately. Peace is still the overriding anxiety, the main talking point of the Republicans. The Democrats can take it from them but only if they begin to talk sense on foreign policy, and above all keep their fire concentrated on Dulles. He has succeeded in personifying the issue of recklessness in foreign policy, and the Democrats ought not to let him escape the limelight he so foolishly focussed on himself. At the very start of a campaign that seemed devoid of major issues, Dulles has created one for the Democrats. It is made all the more important by the President's indications

Why Neutralism Grows in Japan

Those Offshore Islands As Seen From Tokyo

"Most of the moderate Japanese leaders recognize that Formosa proper is a part of the same 'island chain' to which Japan herself belongs and they understand why the U.S. pledged itself to defend it. True, some American military experts (particularly in the Air Force) have begun questioning whether the 'island chain' is as indispensable to our security as it seemed before the advent of the new long-range atomic bombers. Nevertheless . . . the Japanese understand that if the Communists invade Formosa this means that they are seeking general war and Japan will be involved. But what happens if the Communists attack the offshore islands? The Nationalist Government has crammed them with men and equipment even though they have little strategic value except in connection with an invasion of the mainland. With the idea of deterring a Communist attack, the U.S. decided to leave open whether or not it would help defend the islands. To the Japanese this seemed to entrust the final decision between peace and war to the two rival Chinese governments. Even warm friends of the U.S. became alarmed . . . the basic situation which causes Japanese apprehensions will continue as long as American bases exist on Japanese soil; for if the U.S. were at war with mainland China its planes would fly sorties from those bases and Communist Chinese planes would retaliate. What is necessary is to convince the Japanese people that the risks inherent in this situation are far less than the risks they would run without American protection. . . . On our side we can argue the proposition most effectively not by underlining the risks for Japan of trying to 'go it alone' but in demonstrating that the risks of the American alliance will not be enlarged . . . because of our intransigence on a minor issue or because the final decision of our policy seemed to have been left to third parties which do not have the same stake in peace as do the U.S. and Japan."

—Hamilton Fish Armstrong, "Japan at Cross Purposes," *Foreign Affairs*, January 1956.

that he will not try to draft Warren and his praise of Nixon. For Nixon sided with Dulles in favor of intervention in Indo-China. Should Nixon rather than Eisenhower be the candidate, recklessness in foreign policy must become the No. 1 issue of the campaign.

What have George and Stevenson been saying obscurely or privately which could be the basis of a vigorous Democratic foreign policy? First of all, the need for negotiation. If there is no alternative to peace, there is no alternative to diplomacy. This led George and Stevenson to help push Eisenhower toward last year's meeting at the summit, and has led George to warn several times that peace in the Far East depended on a

(Continued on Page Four)

While Ridgway Protests Army Cuts, the Air Lobby Screams for More Funds

Eisenhower Leaves Dulles Out on A Limb Over That Brink

When the President's remarks at press conference January 19 are taken in conjunction with the testimony of General Ridgway, as given in the box below, it would seem that Secretary of State Dulles was not telling the truth about any one of those three occasions on which he says peace was saved by decisions to wage atomic war. The first occasion was a supposed threat to atom bomb Manchuria if there was no truce in Korea; the President indicated that any such action was out of the question because it would have "shocked international opinion." The second occasion was the Indochinese war. According to General Ridgway, it was decided *not* to intervene and his military objections (as reported at the time) plays a part in that decision. The third occasion was over the offshore islands, Quemoy and Matsu. Mr. Dulles told *Life* he never doubted that Eisenhower would have regarded an attack on Quemoy and Matsu as an attack on Formosa—and therefore subject to retaliation in accord with the special Formosan war powers resolution of last January. But the President repeated at press conference that there was no way for anyone "unless he is a far greater genius than I am" to know in advance "what that attack was going to mean when it came about." Either the President or Mr. Dulles must be wrong.

The Ridgway articles in the *Saturday Evening Post* are worth close study. Like the Admirals some years back in their revolt against the B-36 program, Ridgway argues that mass destruction by H-bombing would be un-Christian, though he has no trouble in reconciling tactical A-bombs (much less war itself of course) with Gospel. Some Generals have argued that atomic war is so terrible that future wars will have to be fought with non-atomic weapons: Q.E.D. the need for bigger armies and bigger appropriations for conventional arms. Not so Ridgway. He is almost exuberant in his description of the way atomic wars will be fought; his point is that they will require bigger armies and that it is therefore wrong to reduce the Army's share of the military budget while increasing that of the Air Force. His sincerity need not be questioned but he is certainly naive in complaining that he could not get all the funds he wanted because of "political" decisions by "civilians" in charge of defense, especially his *bête noire*, Secretary Wilson. But who ever heard of a General who did not want more funds than he was getting? Those Democrats and labor leaders who are echoing Ridgway ought to have their heads examined. To complain of "politics" by "civilians" is to complain that we do not hand over control of basic military and budgetary decisions to the military. Civilian control is written into the Constitution, and "politics" is the process of arriving at the general consensus in a free society. Generals are never satisfied; from 1948 through 1957 we will have spent almost 322 billions of dollars on the armed services. "If we cannot feel secure after this astronomical outlay," the *Chicago Tribune* asked in a very pungent editorial (Jan. 20) on "Ridgway's Outcry," "when are we ever going to be able

Yet He Still Has Power to Set The World Ablaze

Ridgway and Dulles Agree Rhee Can't Be Trusted

"With 600,000 ROK troops under arms in Korea, we felt that we ran relatively little risk of renewed attack from the Red Chinese in the event our own Army forces were withdrawn. However . . . no one knew what our old and belligerent friend, Syngman Rhee, might do if we were not there to restrain him. . . . The possibility that Mr. Rhee may send his armies marching north at any moment still exists. And nobody, so far as I am aware, knows exactly what we would do if that should happen . . . the flareup of new war in the Far East might well be the spark that would set the whole world aflame."

—General Ridgway, *Saturday Evening Post*, Jan. 28.

"Far from wanting to end the war, Rhee wanted to renew it. His goal was to reunify all Korea. The release of the prisoners, he hoped, would force the Communists to break off negotiations and the war would be resumed."

—*Life Magazine*, How Dulles Averted War, Jan. 16.

to feel secure?" A significant point is that while labor generally supports higher arms appropriations, Ridgway complains of the "business men" in the Defense Department. Apparently at this moment in our history the only people who worry about the inflationary impact and fantastic cost of an arms race are some of the business men. The alliance of labor and the military in support of the arms race does not at all fit into Marxist clichés about Wall Street warmongers.

Though history shows arms races lead to war even leaders as thoughtful as Reuther (much less the Spellmanite Meany) are content with the drift so long as it provides jobs for building workers, mechanics, truck drivers, seamen, etc. Ridgway's lament about the stepchild treatment given the Army did not keep the air lobby last week from greedily opening up on its own. Though the new budget ups obligatory authority for the air force by two and a half billions and expenditures by one billion, *Aviation Week* screamed of "The New Airpower Fraud" and *Air Force* magazine sees the 137-wing air force program sabotaged. The latest Fact Sheet (RD-56-32) of the Democratic National Committee also complains that the air force is being cut. The one sector of industry which depends completely on world tension is aviation, and the profits and backlogs of the big companies in this period are fantastic. Symington and Finletter among the Democrats are their sounding boards. The whole world has a vital interest in putting the brakes on the arms race: its inflationary potential and its diversion of human and natural resources to a growing pile of rapidly obsolescing weapons of destruction and new monsters of fear and human self-destruction. The Democrats had better talk sense on this subject.

Ridgway's Story on Indochina Disagrees With The Dulles Account

"The second time that the U.S. was brought to the brink of war came in April of 1954. The French situation in Indochina had become desperate. The French pleaded for American intervention in the form of a carrier strike. . . . Dulles concluded that a carrier strike against Dienbienphu's attackers was a poor way for the U.S. to get involved. . . . On April 4, Dulles went to the White House with Admiral Arthur Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to present Eisenhower with a proposal for action. If Britain would join the U.S. and France would agree to stand firm, Dulles pointed out, the three Western states could combine with friendly Asian nations to oppose the Communist forces on the ground in Indochina just as the UN stepped in

against the North Korean aggression in 1950. . . . President Eisenhower concurred."

—*Life Magazine*, How Dulles Averted War, Jan. 16.

" . . . there was a strong advocacy, in some quarters, for us to send troops to Indochina. I did not share that view, knowing the military hazards it presented, in the light of the fact that the focus of infection lay outside the confines of Indochina. And I believe that the analysis which I directed the Army to make and to present to higher authority played a considerable part in our Government's decision not to embark on that tragic adventure."

—Gen. Ridgway, *Saturday Evening Post*, Jan. 28.

Government Delaying Action on Two Fronts in Defense of Faceless Informers

Brownell's Attack on Harry Cain for "Bias" Backfires

Brownell's attack on Harry Cain for bias in the Washington Pension Union case has misfired badly. Instead of isolating the witch-hunter-turned-crusader, it has won him the unanimous support of his colleagues on the Subversive Activities Control Board. Instead of a one-man fight by Cain against the Attorney General's list and his use of faceless informers, the entire Board has been pushed into a posture of hostility toward Brownell. This first open breach between two agencies engaged in "listing" may prove an important political development. The breach was brought about, characteristically, because Brownell is too tricky; he alienates even those who might generally be disposed to agree with him. In this case, the Attorney General did not have the honesty to ask for Cain's disqualification on the ground that he was biased in favor of the Washington Pension Union. Instead he took the extraordinary step of asking the Board to reopen a motion for disqualification originally made against Cain by the Washington Pension Union but since withdrawn. At the same time the government cited an article in the November issue of *Coronet* and Cain's remarks in defense of an accused government employee in a security hearing as evidence of bias in favor of the Washington Pension Union! Brownell's maneuvers were as tortuous as a corkscrew. Since the W.P.U. insisted that it no longer wanted Cain disqualified and neither side claimed that he had been unfair in the actual conduct of the hearings, the SACB might have rejected the government's motion out of hand. It chose instead to examine fully the charges of bias pro and con. The Board ruled that insofar as Cain's remarks about the WPU in *Coronet* are concerned, it saw nothing in them beyond "what in a criminal case would be termed the presumption of innocence." As for the security hearing, it found that Cain did no more than declare that he was "not qualified to say" whether the Pension Union was a Communist front. The truth is that Cain was once violently biased against the Pension Union and other Left organizations, and that this violent bias recommended him for his present post. Close observation of security excesses has led him to adopt a more astringent, humane and skeptical attitude, and it is this which riles the Justice Department. The attack on Cain, like the earlier attack on Judge Youngdahl in the Lattimore case, shows that in Brownell's lexicon a judge is biased who does not start out with his mind set against the accused. The hearings resume February 16. Cain sits as hearing examiner on the Attorney General's petition to declare the Pension Union a Communist front within the meaning of the Internal Security Act and to force its registration with the SACB. (For the background of this case, see our issue of last November 28.)

To Appeal or Not to Appeal?

The Department of Justice cannot make up its mind whether to appeal the Circuit Court decision in San Francisco last October against the use of faceless informers in the port security program, or try to wiggle through a tiny loophole in that ruling. So last week it obtained a two month extension from Mr. Justice Douglas of the time in which it may file an appeal to the Supreme Court. The new deadline is March 24. The loophole is that concluding portion of the decision (*Parker v. Lester*, see our Nov. 7 issue) in which the Circuit Court said it was not deciding "whether in subsequent attempts to carry out the objectives of the merchant seamen screening program, regulations might be adopted which in some degree qualify the ordinary right to confrontation and cross-examination of informers." The Court was referring to the practice of providing a resumé of the charges instead of producing witnesses. At the same time in a footnote the court made clear that counsel for an accused seaman should have the right "to challenge the resumé furnished to him and to require a demonstration that it is indeed a fair one. We do not presently know," the court added, "how that could be done without access at least to the investigative agency's original

Lawyers Rebuff Witch Hunters

New York—The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the most important local bar association in the country, voted 57 to 101 last week against a proposal to discipline lawyers for membership in the Communist party and 60 to 85 against a proposal for disciplinary action where lawyers invoke the Fifth amendment in an inquiry as to Communist activities.

The vote was in striking contrast to recommendations of the Eastland committee. Its Matusow report proposed legislation barring from practice in the Federal courts or agencies lawyers who had not sworn a non-Communist affidavit or had refused to testify about Communist activities.

The vote may also set back plans which the House Un-American Activities Committee has for some time had "under advisement," but not yet put into effect. These would require any lawyer appearing before the House committee on behalf of a client to swear that he was not a Communist.

report." This means counsel could subpoena the original FBI reports and check the resumé against them. But the FBI might consider this worse than being forced to produce witnesses. The reason for this touches on an aspect of the informer issue which has been lost to sight in current discussion. The issue has been debated as if there were only two clandestine sources of information, the "casual" and the "professional" informer. There is a third, as the evidence in the Judy Coplon trial showed. Slips were introduced citing informants T-1, T-2, etc. These "T" informants were wiretaps. To allow the accused in security cases to see the original investigative reports would disclose the extent to which the various gumshoe agencies of the government use wiretapping and other illegal or improper techniques of surveillance. So in the end the government may be forced to appeal, especially since suits for back wages totalling hundreds of thousands of dollars have been started or threatened on behalf of seamen denied clearance.

Faceless Informers and Passports

The FBI always insists that it merely gathers but does not evaluate information; this, it argues, is the function of administrative and judicial agencies. But who evaluates where the source of the information is not disclosed? This tantalizing question is raised by the answers Secretary of State Dulles gave the Court of Appeals here in the Boudin passport case, answers which the Court rejected last week as "not responsive." The Court asked whether the attorney Leonard B. Boudin had done anything adverse to American interests while abroad under his last passport: whether State Department had information which led it to believe that he would do something adverse to American interests if given a new passport; and if it had such information, did it know the sources and had it evaluated their credibility. The Secretary of State replied with the one word "no" to the first question, and with a very vague and general assertion of suspicion to the second. On the last question the Secretary of State admitted that the information came in part from informants unknown to the State Department "but whose credibility has been evaluated and made known to the Department by the Government agency furnishing the information." Does this mean the FBI is now evaluating its sources of information? This is a question which might well be pressed when the case is finally argued before the Court of Appeals. Judge Youngdahl's decision was that passports could not be refused on the basis of undisclosed and anonymous accusation. Should the Court of Appeals uphold him, a blow will have been struck at the faceless informer in another vital section, that of the right to travel.

Israel, Unlike Czechoslovakia, Will Not Surrender to A New Munich

(Continued from Page One)

meeting at the Foreign Ministers' level with Communist China. The impasse in the Formosa straits must lead ultimately to war or a humiliating national backdown on our part unless some way is found to get us off the limb onto which we climbed when we threw a protectorate over Formosa. Last year's S. J. Res. 55, sponsored by Kefauver, Humphrey, Sparkman, Morse, Mansfield, Fulbright, Lehman, Magnuson, Neuberger and Hill offered a way out by inviting the United Nations to step in and bring about "a definitive settlement of the future status of Formosa and the Pescadores." It was buried in the fake war alarums with which Dulles pushed the Formosan war powers resolution and the mutual security pact with Chiang through the Senate last year; it ought now to be revived.

Germans Pressing Again for Unity

In Europe the German issue will not be settled by continued insistence that we will agree to unification only if Germany joins NATO. The West Germans are pressing for new talks at the summit, and Stevenson indicated that we ought to talk instead of unification in terms of genuinely free elections. A neutralized Germany as part of a neutralized belt to include the East European satellite states would give American diplomacy initiative. Another position from which the Democrats ought to break away is the insistence on Eisenhower's spurious "open sky" plan* as the sine qua non of disarmament. American policy is being associated in the world today with a whole series of stale "nyets" on Germany, on disarmament, on H-bomb tests, and on the mutual lifting of iron curtains.

* The day Soviet Premier Bulganin's letter was delivered at the White House, the Washington *Evening Star's* diplomatic correspondent, Constantine Brown, reported: "No responsible statesman in or out of the UN ever expected the Reds to buy the Eisenhower Geneva proposal in the first place. American military men were aghast at the very idea at first, until they realized, as they did quickly, that the plan was devoid of significance even if it were to be approved. Almost anything could be hidden from the most alert aerial reconnaissance. And would a squadron of aircraft loading atomic bombs on a runway be distinguished from a similar squadron loading Christmas presents for Hottentots? But the President and his advisers realized the propaganda value of the surprise proposal..."

Send A Gift Sub with Your Renewal and Bring Some Friend Back to the Ranks of Active Liberalism

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:
1/30/56

(To) Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

Senator Confesses

An agreeable backwash of the Eastland committee's investigation of the press is the resignation of its counsel Jay Sourwine. In his letter to Senator Eastland, Mr. Sourwine said he was resigning "for personal reasons," but he told the press he had written the chairman of the Nevada State Democratic Central Committee "to clear" him (an odd choice of words for a witch hunter) for nomination as U. S. Senator to fill the seat of Alan Bible, who will not be a candidate for reelection. Mr. Sourwine's resignation was dated one week after he released the Matusow report, with its innuendoes about the New York Times, the Alsops and several leading American papers. The release was made, according to the best information here, without consulting the committee and without obtaining the signatures of its members. Senator Eastland in his reply of January 16 to the letter of resignation insisted "But I need your help a little longer"—and therefore accepted the resignation as of January 31. The parting guest was thus sped with the minimum two weeks notice. Among the tributes the Senator paid Mr. Sourwine was one which hardly reflects credit on the U.S. Senate. "I happen to know," Senator Eastland wrote, "that when Title II of the Internal Security Act was adopted by the Senate, you were the only living man who knew exactly what was in it."

There is finally the most immediate and explosive problem of the Middle East. This will not be solved by sacrificing Israel to the Arab States, nor by competing with the Soviets for their favor. Both blocs at the UN last week united in high moral gestures against Israel while they are prepared for the sake of oil and power politics to curry favor with some of the most backward, feudal and corrupt regimes in the world. The Soviet Union ought to be challenged on the discrepancy between its campaign for peace and its shipment of arms into the area most likely to explode; Moscow and Belgrade alike are playing a game cynically out of keeping with their peaceful and neutralist professions. There is ample room and basis for settling the Arab-Israeli dispute, and resettling the Arab refugees, by conditioning economic aid on a settlement. But to move toward a new Munich at Israel's expense as Eden and Dulles may be planning to do is to court trouble. Israel, unlike Czechoslovakia, will not surrender.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office